UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,269	08/09/2001	Thomas D. Petite	081607-1210	5550

24504 7590 07/01/2003

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER
BARAN, MARY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2857	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/925,269	PETITE, THOMAS D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mary Kate B Baran	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 April 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 April 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 08 April 2003. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended. Claims 27-29 are new.

2. The amendments filed on 08 April 2003 are sufficient to overcome the prior drawing, specification, and claim objections.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The substitute specification contains many spacing errors like the ones found on page 1 lines 5, 27 and page 3 line 4. Applicant's assistance is requested in finding and correcting these minor errors. The substitute specification has not been entered.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 27, page 12 line 7, "remote device" should be – remote devices –.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim R j ctions - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-16, 19-23, 26, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,491) (hereinafter Canada) in view of Shaughnessy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,137) (hereinafter Shaughnessy).

Referring to claim 1, Canada teaches a wireless communication network adapted for use in an automated monitoring system for monitoring and controlling (see Canada, column 8 lines 6-34) a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in

communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers, the site controller configured to receive the original data messages and the repeated data messages (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), identify the remote device associated with the corresponding sensor data signal (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35) and provide information related to the sensor data to the host computer (see Canada et a., Figure 8 "PC Network 10"). Canada does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 2, Canada discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see

Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 3, Canada further teaches a site controller further configured to provide a command message to one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and each of the plurality of wireless transceivers are further configured to transmit, in response to the command message, the original data message, wherein the original data message corresponds to the command message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 4, Shaughnessy further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 34-45); and a command indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 7, Canada further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada, column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 8, Canada discloses a wireless communication network adapted for use in an automated monitoring system for monitoring and controlling (see Canada, column 8 lines 6-15) a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless communication means configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67) and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57); a means for receiving each of the original data messages and the repeated data messages (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57); a means for identifying, for each received message, the remote device associated with the corresponding sensor data signal (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35); and a means for providing information related to the sensor data signal to the host computer (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54). Canada does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 9, Canada teaches a plurality of repeating means having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeating means in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless communication means and comprising a means for receiving the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and a means for transmitting a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38). Canada does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 10, Canada teaches a means for providing a command message to one of the plurality of wireless communication means, wherein each of the wireless communication means further comprise a means for transmitting, in response to the command message, the original data message, wherein the original data message corresponds to the command message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 11, Shaughnessy further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a means for identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 14-32); a means for identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 34-45); and a command means for specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 12, Canada further teaches a data packet further comprising: a means for indicating a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada, column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total

number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 13, Canada discloses a wireless communication network for monitoring and controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57, the repeated data message (see Canada,

column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), wherein at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to provide the original data messages and the repeated data messages to a site controller (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57). Canada does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 14, Canada discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see

Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 15, Canada teaches at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to receive a command message for one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 16, Shaughnessy further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 34-45); and a command indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet would have

allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 19, Canada further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada, column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 20, Canada discloses a wireless communication network for monitoring and controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a

plurality of wireless transceivers having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), each of the plurality of wireless transceivers configured to receive a sensor data signal from one of the plurality of remote devices and transmit an original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier and sensor data signal (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54), and further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67) including the sensor data signal and the corresponding unique identifier (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57); and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers, wherein at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to provide the original data messages and the repeated data messages to a primary wireless communication network associated with an automated monitoring system (see Canada, column 4 lines 41-57). Canada does not teach a wide area network, or a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2) and a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol, or using a wireless connection, would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 21, Canada discloses a plurality of repeaters having unique identifiers (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), each of the plurality of repeaters in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and configured to receive the original data message transmitted by the at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 61-67), the repeated data message including the sensor data signal from the original data message and the unique identifier corresponding to the repeater (see Canada, column 8 lines 36-38), but does not teach a predefined communication protocol.

Shaughnessy teaches a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined protocol would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 22, Canada teaches at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers is further configured to receive a command message for one of the plurality of wireless transceivers from the primary wireless communication network and transmit the command message to the one of the plurality of wireless transceivers (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 23, Shaughnessy further teaches the predefined communication protocol comprises a data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 49-58) comprising: a receiver address identifying the receiver of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 14-32); a sender address identifying the sender of the data packet (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 34-45); and a command indicator specifying a predefined command code (see Shaughnessy, column 6 lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a predefined communication protocol with a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 26, Canada further teaches the data packet comprises, a packet length indicator which indicates a total number of bytes in the current packet (see Canada, column 5 lines 50-59), but does not teach a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message; and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet; and a message number identifying the current message.

Shaughnessy discloses a total packet indicator which indicates the total number of packets in the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 4 lines 8-17); and a current packet indicator which identifies the current packet (see Shaughnessy, column 5

lines 49-51); and a message number identifying the current message (see Shaughnessy, column 5 lines 54-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada, to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because using a data packet would have allowed the skilled artisan to provide multiple communications within the network (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 50-53).

Referring to claim 27, Canada teaches a method for enabling customers to monitor remote devices, the method comprising the steps of: establishing a wireless communication network that enables a user to monitor at least one remote device (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36), the wireless communication network comprising: a plurality of wireless transceivers each integrated with one of the plurality of remote devices and having a unique identifier (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35) and configured to receive a sensor data signal from the remote device and transmit an original data message (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-54), the original data message comprising the corresponding unique identifier for the originating wireless transceiver (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), each wireless transceiver further configured to receive the original data message transmitted by one of the other wireless transceivers and transmit a repeated data messaging (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), the repeated data message including the originating wireless transceiver and the repeating wireless transceiver (see Canada, column 4 lines 41-57), and a site controller in communication with at least one of the plurality of wireless transceivers, the site

controller configured to receive the original data messages and the repeated data messages (see Canada, column 4 lines 50-57), identify the remote device associated with the corresponding sensor data signal (see Canada, column 5 lines 13-35), and provide information related to the sensor data signal to a host computer (see Canada, Figure 8 "PC Network 10"). Canada does not teach a wide area network, a predefined communication protocol, and multiple customer or organization system access.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2), a predefined communication protocol (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 41-48), and multiple customer or organization system access (see Shaughnessy, column 3 lines 49-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN and transmitting using a predefined protocol, or using a wireless connection, would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

Referring to claim 29, Canada further teaches enabling at least one remote device corresponding to a customer of the organization to communicate with the wireless communication network so that the remote device may be monitored (see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36). Canada does not teach a wide area network.

Shaughnessy teaches a wide area network (see Shaughnessy, Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada to include the teachings of Shaughnessy because connecting the system to a WAN would have allowed the skilled artisan to distribute processing which will increase scalability (see Shaughnessy, column 2 lines 45-49).

6. Claims 5, 6, 17, 18, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,491) (hereinafter Canada) in view of Shaughnessy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,137) (hereinafter Shaughnessy) and further in view of Casais (U.S. Patent No. 6,288,641).

Referring to claims 5, 17 and 24, Canada and Shaughnessy teach al. the features of the claimed invention except for a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via Bluetooth technology.

Casais teaches a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via Bluetooth technology (see Casais, column 5 lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Canada and Shaughnessy to include the teachings of Casais because remote monitoring with Bluetooth technologies would have allowed the skilled artisan to increase flexibility of positioning and repositioning.

Referring to claims 6, 18 and 25, Canada and Shaughnessy teach al. the features of the claimed invention except for a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via IEEE standard 802.11(b).

Casais teaches a plurality of wireless transceivers further configured to receive signals via IEEE standard 802.11(b) (see Casais, column 5 lines 36-50).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Canada and Shaughnessy to include the teachings of Casais because remote monitoring using IEEE standard 802.11(b) would have allowed the skilled artisan to increase flexibility of positioning and repositioning.

7. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,491) (hereinafter Canada) in view of Shaughnessy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,347) (hereinafter Shaughnessy) and further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,994).

Referring to claim 28, Canada and Shaughnessy teach all the features of the claimed invention except for receiving compensation for providing the organization access to the wireless communication network.

Chen teaches receiving compensation in the form of payment for providing access to the wireless communication network (see Chen, column 6 lines 54-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Canada and Shaughnessy to include the teachings of

Chen because requiring compensation would have allowed the skilled artisan to prevent pirating and illegal use of the monitoring services provided.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 08 April 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to combine Canada and Shaughnessy, because they are non-analogous art. However, both Canada and Shaughnessy disclose wireless communication monitoring systems, see Canada, column 4 lines 31-36, and Shaughnessy, column 1 lines 9-11. The Examiner therefore asserts that both these references teach wireless communication monitoring systems, which is "in the field of the applicant's endeavor".

Applicant further argues that Canada does not teach "controlling a plurality of remote devices via a host computer." Canada, however, does teach this limitation (see Canada, column 8 lines 6-15, column 10 lines 10-30 and lines 41-50). Canada teaches a command station which allows the user to control the time length, the frequency of status polls and the order of devices (see Canada, column 8 lines 6-15). Canada further teaches that this command station synchronizes the devices to turn on and off at a specified time (see Canada, column 8 lines 18-34). Therefore the limitation of "controlling a plurality of devices via a host computer" is taught by Canada.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Kate B Baran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4474. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marc S Hoff can be reached on (703) 308-1677. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

MKB
June 26, 2003

MARC S. HOFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800